Remarks/Arguments

In this, the first Action in the case, the Examiner allowed claims 1-4. The remaining claims, claims 5-22, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. patent no. 5,253,285 (Alheim).

In response to the rejection, applicant has amended the independent claims – claims 5, 11, 17, and 20 – to recite the invention with more specificity.

Claims 5 and 11 as amended recite that characters of both a first type and of a second type can be represented by the same signals, and a converter converts each received <u>character</u> of one type into a <u>character</u> of the other type that is representable by the same signals.

In contrast, Alheim discloses that a typical TDD operates in two modes, i.e., either in letters mode or numbers mode. The TDD receives TDD decodable tones (signals) and converts those signals into either letter characters or number characters depending upon the mode that it is operating in. This is clearly different form the claimed invention, which requires the conversion of the <u>characters</u> themselves, as opposed to the <u>signals</u> that represent the characters of both types, from one type of character to the other. There is no corresponding teaching in Alheim. Consequently, Alheim does not render unpatentable the claims as amended, and so applicant requests that the rejection of claims 5-16 be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 20 as amended reference the signal-to-text conversion gateway that is responsive to a signal received from the end-user device (destination) to change its conversion mode. As the Examiner acknowledged in allowing claims 1-4, such a gateway is not taught or suggested in the prior art. And, since the gateway is not taught or suggested, neither is an end-user device that operates to control the conversion mode of the gateway. Consequently, Alheim does not render unpatentable the claims as amended, and so applicant requests that the rejection of claims 17-22 be withdrawn.

Applicant has also taken this opportunity to correct a typographical error in claim 16 which resulted in line 3 of the claim appearing twice.

The claim rejection having been properly addressed and disposed of, applicant suggests that the application is now ready for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that the application be reconsidered and thereafter be passed to issue.

Applicant considers the foregoing to be dispositive of all issues in the application. But, if the Examiner should deem that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution, applicant invites the Examiner to call his attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Michaelis

By _____

David Volejnicek
Corporate Counsel
Reg. No. 29355
303-538-4154

Date: 15 Jan. 2008

Avaya Inc.
Docket Administrator
307 Middletown-Lincroft Road
Room 1N-391
Lincroft, NJ 07738